

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
FLORENCE DIVISION

DANIEL K. FRIEND, )  
                        )  
Plaintiff,           )  
                        )  
vs.                   )         Civil Action No.: 6:10-197-TLW-KFM  
                        )  
MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, COMMISSIONER )  
OF SOCIAL SECURITY      )  
ADMINISTRATION,        )  
                        )  
Defendant.            )  
                        )

---

**ORDER**

Plaintiff brought this action pursuant to 205(g) of the Social Security Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the defendant, Commissioner of Social Security, denying he claims for disability benefits. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), (D.S.C.). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the decision of the Commissioner be reversed under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), with a remand of the case to the Commissioner for further proceedings as discussed in the Report. (Doc. # 17). The defendant filed an objection on January 28, 2011. (Doc. # 19).

This Court has reviewed the cited cases and the Magistrate Judge’s analysis. In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final

determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992) (citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, *de novo*, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. # 17). Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED** with a remand of the case to the Commissioner for further proceedings as discussed in the Report.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

February 28, 2011  
Florence, South Carolina